

NOMENCLATURAL NOTES ON HYPERICUM

HENRY J. LOTT

Hypericum tubulosum Walter var. **Walteri** (Gmel.), comb. nov.

Hypericum petiolatum Walter, Fl. Carol. 191 (1788). — Non Linnaeus (1763).

Hypericum Walteri Gmelin, Syst. Nat. 2: 1159 (1791), as *Hypericon Walteri*. — Lott in Jour. Arnold Arb. 19: 151 (1938).

Professor Fernald kindly drew my attention to the invalidity of the combination *Hypericum Walteri* var. *tubulosum* (Walt.) Lott. Since *H. tubulosum* Walt. (1788) antedates *H. Walteri* Gmel. (1791), the former name must be maintained for the species, with *H. Walteri* var. *tubulosum* as a synonym, and *H. Walteri* reduced to varietal rank.

Hypericum fasciculatum Lamarck, Encycl. Méthod. 4: 160 (1797).

Hypericum aspalathoides Willdenow, Sp. Pl. 3: 1451 (1803).

Hypericum galioides var. *cubense* & var. *axillare* Griseb., Cat. Pl. Cubens. 39 (1866). — **Synon. nov.**

Hypericum limosum Grisebach, Cat. Pl. Cubens. 39 (1866). — **Synon. nov.**

The extremes of this species are remarkably distinct; at one end of the series is a form having leaves which do not exceed 5 mm., and at the other a form in which all the leaves are over 2 cm. long. The habitat, habit, fasciculation of the leaves, inflorescence, length of sepals in relation to petals, and the size and shape of the capsule are also exceedingly variable characters on the specimens which I have seen. After a careful study of well over one hundred sheets of this species in the herbarium of the Arnold Arboretum and of the Gray Herbarium, I find, as Coulter did when he monographed the North American species of *Hypericum*, that the forms of *H. fasciculatum* intergrade so gradually as to make segregation impracticable.

If Lamarck's type material of *H. fasciculatum* consists, as Coulter states (in Bot. Gaz. 11: 85. 1886, & in Gray, Synop. Fl. N. Am. 1: 286. 1897), of the short-leaved form, this leaf-form certainly cannot be separated and called *H. aspalathoides*, as some taxonomists do. Coulter's statement, however, is undoubtedly erroneous. There is nothing which indicates that he ever saw the type, and those who, like Gray, actually examined type material applied the name *H. fasciculatum* to the long-

leaved form. Lamarck's description of the leaves, "Les feuilles sont . . . moins courtes que les entrenoeuds, longues d'environ un demi-pouce sur une largeur qui excède rarement un tiers de ligne.", unmistakably applies to the long-leaved form, but it is possible that Coulter misinterpreted Lamarck's description, for the clause "les feuilles sont moins courtes que les entrenoeuds" can be very easily misread as "the leaves are shorter than the internodes." This apparent slight misinterpretation would be sufficient to lead one into error.

Taxonomists who distinguish the short-leaved form of this species either as *H. aspalathoides* Willd. or *H. fasciculatum* var. *aspalathoides* (Willd.) Torr. & Gray, have overlooked the fact that Willdenow did not describe a new species under this name. Willdenow, disregarding priority, proposed the new name *H. aspalathoides* for Lamarck's *H. fasciculatum* because he preferred to use the epithet *fasciculatum* for *H. fasciculatum* Michaux (1803), non Lamarck (1797). Willdenow's description of *H. aspalathoides* is an abridged Latin translation of Lamarck's description without original additions. It appears that even the specific name *aspalathoides* is taken from the description of Lamarck who, describing the leaves, states, "Il a, pour ainsi dire, le feuillage d'un gènèvrier ou de certains *aspalathus* . . ."

Torrey and Gray were apparently the first (Fl. N. Am. 1: 672. 1840) to restrict the use of Willdenow's name to the short-leaved form of *H. fasciculatum*. They proposed *H. fasciculatum* var. *aspalathoides* for their previously described *H. fasciculatum* var. β , and cited in the synonymy "*H. aspalathoides* Willd. (*H. rosmarinifolium*, Kinn, in *herb. Willd.*!)". When traveling in Europe, Gray saw, according to the citation, in the herbarium of Willdenow a specimen of the short-leaved form of *H. fasciculatum* labeled with the herbarium name of Kinn,¹ *H. rosmarinifolium*, and identified as *H. aspalathoides*. Torrey and Gray concluded that this was the type-specimen of Willdenow's *H. aspalathoides*, but the very text of Willdenow's Species Plantarum shows this conclusion to be incorrect. In the preface (Sp. Pl. 1: vii. 1797), Willdenow states, "Plantas Herbarii proprii, quas vel vivas (v. v.) vel siccas (v. s.) vel sine flore vivas (v. v. s. fl.) vel sine flore siccas (v. s. s. fl.) vel modo cum fructu siccas (v. s. c. fr.) vidi, adhibitis heic indicatis signis notavi, ut quisque videret, quaenam vegetabilia ex aliorum descriptionibus descripta assumserim." The lack in Willdenow's description of any such abbreviated reference to a specimen is a certain indication that

¹Barnhart (in *Bartonia*, 9: 38-39. 1926) says: "Matthias Kinn was a German who came to America in the latter part of the eighteenth century to collect plants and seeds for exportation to his native land." See also: Meehan in *Gard. Monthly*, 6: 260-261, 338-339 (1864). — Harshberger, *Botanists of Philadelphia*, 184 (1899).

at that time he did not have Kinn's specimen, or, at least, that this specimen had not been identified as *H. aspalathoides*. This evidence that Willdenow published *H. aspalathoides* without having seen a specimen strengthens the conclusion that he merely changed the name *H. fasciculatum* to *H. aspalathoides*, and did not describe a new species.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.